

## **Major Points: WWGMHB Customer Survey conducted in January 2006**

\*Confidential customer and client survey planned in late 2005 to be conducted in January 2006. Focus was on Board work in 2004 and 2005.

\*Survey modeled on that of Central Puget Sound GMHB and the Environmental Hearings Office.

\*Survey responses were invited by postal mail, or, if respondent chose to forgo confidentiality, via e-mail.

\*Conducted in fulfillment of an element of the GMHBs' Strategic Plan, particularly Goal Two, item e.

Enhance the Boards' focus on service to all stakeholders.

Conduct "customer surveys" with parties to Board cases to solicit feedback on the Boards' procedures and levels of service.

\*Results of the 26 responses compiled to give a flavor of responders' opinions. Approximately 150 surveys were issued.

\*Survey provided opportunity for those who chose to vent or to give thoughtful, direct feedback. The survey also served to inform people about some case practices and order features and of available services on the WWGMHB website.

- Some 41% of respondents were attorneys and 41% were *pro se* participants in a case or cases.
- Respondents filled out /checked off rank-order choices and provided written comments.
- While postmarks were the only real guide, it appears responses came in from at least eight (8) counties in Western Washington.
- In general, respondents expressed the view that Board decisions and practices continue to improve even under the budgetary constraints and limited staffing under which it operates.
- There are problems with getting a good Index of Record and quality exhibits before the Board: a challenge as much for petitioners and certain local governments as it is any sort of issue for the Board.
- Many respondents recognized that any problems with adjudication have as much to do with limitations and constraints in the GMA statute as it does with Board approaches to adjudication.
- A percentage of respondents stated the Board should be more bold in imposing invalidity, holding it as long as necessary, and recommending the imposition of sanctions.

\*Respondents had mixed views on consolidation and combining/tracking of cases. Many requested clear explanations of the rules and practices governing consolidation of cases.

\*61% of respondents stated they utilized the GMHB website and its links to recent and historic cases and the available digest of decisions. Some links are apparently broken. 30% of respondents stated they consult the printed copy of the Digest of Decisions.

\*Respondents liked the summation of the case decision at the front end of written orders (FDOs and decisions on motions).

\*Some responders asked for more clarity on how, and under what terms, an intervenor may participate in case adjudication.

\*Some responders asked for more clarity on the timely filing and eligibility of dispositive motions.

\*Opinions on the clarity and helpfulness of orders of the Board varied. A full spectrum of opinion was offered.

\*Responders ranked the overall accessibility and performance of Board members as Good or Very Good.

\*There were a variety of comments on staff services. However, despite very slim staffing, a full 57% of responders were very satisfied with staff services and courtesies.